REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 3, 4, 11, and 13 have been canceled, claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12, 23, 24, and 29 have been amended, and claims 14-22, 25-28, and 30-33 remain as originally filed. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12, and 14-33 are currently pending.

1.   Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action states that "regarding claim 1, the preamble discloses a method for formulation of queries. However, the body of the claim does not describe how to formulate those queries." In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of "receiving a second selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the second menu list; and combining the first selection and second selection to construct at least a portion of a query." Claim 1 has thus been amended to recite receiving first and second selections from menu lists of words and phrases and combining the first and second selections to formulate a query. The body of claim 1, as amended, describes the manner in which the queries disclosed in the preamble are formulated, and therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 112 has been overcome.

Claims 3, 4, and 11 are canceled, and therefore the instant rejection of those claims under 35 USC § 112 is rendered moot.

11

Remaining claims 2 and 5-10 depend from claim 1, and for the reasons provided above

with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims under 35

USC § 112 has been overcome.

2.   Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-11 and 23-33 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Wilson (US 6,460,031).

The Office Action states that regarding claims 1-7 and 29-32, Wilson discloses a method

for formulation of queries for use in accessing information from a knowledge base comprising:

(a) displaying a first menu list of words or phrases; (b) receiving a first selection of at least one of

the words or phrases in the first menu list; (c) obtaining a second menu list of words or phrases

based on the first selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the first menu list, (d)

receiving a second selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the second menu list as per

claim 3, (e) formulating a query from at least the first selection and the second selection as per

claims 4 and 9.

By this Amendment and Response, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of

formulation of queries comprising the steps of displaying a first menu list, receiving user profile

information associated with a user formulating the queries, obtaining a second menu list of words

or phrases based on a first selection of the words or phrases in the first menu list and the user

profile information. The Wilson patent discloses a system and method for titling reports from a

database using a title bar navigator to create and depict a natural language phrase to query a

database. The Wilson system includes sets of data that are manually mapped to the navigator

such that it duplicates the hierarchical structure present in the database. Wilson does not teach a system in which user profile information is used to obtain a second menu list of words or phrases, as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead Wilson only discloses a system in which the hierarchical relationships of the database terms are used to generate choices of data that are available for retrieval. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not rendered unpatentable under 35 USC § 102 in light of the Wilson patent.

Claims 3, 4, and 11 are canceled, and therefore the instant rejection of those claims under 35 USC § 102 is rendered moot.

Remaining claims 2 and 5-10 depend from claim 1 and for the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims under 35 USC § 102 has been overcome.

Independent claim 23 has been amended to include elements similar to those added to claim 1, namely that a natural language query is constructed from a series of user word or phrase menu selections that are associated with a series of menus that are presented to the user and a user profile associated with the user. As stated above with respect to claim 1, the Wilson patent does not disclose a system in which user profile information is used to obtain a series of menus. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is not rendered unpatentable in light of the cited reference.

Independent claim 24 has also been amended to include elements similar to those added to claim 1, namely, computer program code for receiving user profile information associated with a user selecting the first selection; and computer program code for obtaining a second menu list of words or phrases based on the first selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the first

menu list and the user profile information. Therefore, for the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 24 and its dependent claims 25-33 are not anticipated by the cited reference.

3.   Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US 6,460,031), in view of DeLorme (US 5,948,040).

The Office Action states that "regarding claims 12, 17 and 19, Wilson discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claims 1-5. However, Wilson is silent as to use a mobile computing device to operate the method of claims 1-5. On the other hand, DeLorme discloses a mobile computing device using menus to generate queries."

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite a method for facilitating user input in a mobile computing device by constructing one or more phrases, sentences or questions from the series of user word or phrase menu selections, wherein the user word or phrase menu selections with respect to earlier of the menus of the series of menus affects the particular words or phrases in subsequent of the menus of the series of menus, and further wherein the particular words or phrases in the subsequent of the menus is biased with respect to a user profile associated with a user of the mobile computing device.

Wilson only discloses the mapping of data in response to database queries on the basis of hierarchical structures present in the database. The DeLorme patent describes a computerized travel reservation information and planning system that processes user inquiries to generate trip itineraries. Neither Wilson or DeLorme, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the construction of phrases from a series of menu selections in which subsequent menu selections are

14

affected by previous menu selections and biased with respect to a user profile, as claimed in amended claim 12. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by the cited combination.

Claim 13 has been canceled, and therefore the instant rejection of this claim under 35 USC § 103 is rendered moot.

Remaining claims 14-22 depend from claim 12 and for the reasons provided above with respect to claim 12, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims under 35 USC § 103 has been overcome.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above described amendments be made part of the official record in the present application, and respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments is present in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed, and that no new matter has been added.

If there are any shortages, the Examiner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account Number 04-0822.

Respectfully submitted,
DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

Dated: <u>December 17, 2004</u>   By: _____

Geoffrey T. Staniford
Reg. No.: 43,151